

REMARKS

Claims 22-25, 49-52, and 56-62 are presently pending in this application. Claim 22 has been amended in this response.

In the Office Action mailed February 13, 2006, claims 22-25, 49-52, and 56-62 were rejected. More specifically, the status of the application in light of this Office Action is as follows:

(A) Claim 22 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,997,388 to Canella et al. ("Canella");

(B) Claims 22, 23, 25, 49, 50, 52, 56, and 58-62 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Canella in view of Korean Patent No. 426119 to Eom et al. ("Eom"); and

(C) Claims 24, 51, and 57 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Canella and Japanese Patent No. 1067346 to Tsuchiko et al. ("Tsuchiko").

The undersigned attorney wishes to thank the Examiner for engaging in a telephone conference on March 31, 2006, and requests that this paper constitute the applicants' Interview Summary. During the telephone conference, the present Office Action, Canella, Eom, and a proposed amendment to claim 22 were discussed. The Examiner agreed that the proposed amendment patentably distinguishes claim 22 over the applied art. Claim 22 has been amended accordingly. The Examiner further agreed to withdraw the Section 103(a) rejection of claims 22-25, 49-52, and 56-62.

A. Response to the Section 102(a) Rejection

Claim 22 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Canella. In light of the agreement reached during the March 31 telephone conference, the Section 102(a) rejection of claim 22 should be withdrawn.



B. Response to the Section 103(a) Rejection over Canella and Eom

Claims 22, 23, 25, 49, 50, 52, 56, and 58-62 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Canella and Eom. In light of the agreement reached during the March 31 telephone conference, the Section 103(a) rejection of claims 22, 23, 25, 49, 50, 52, 56, and 58-62 should be withdrawn.

C. Response to the Section 103(a) Rejection over Canella and Tsuchiko

Claims 24, 51, and 57 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Canella and Tsuchiko. In light of the agreement reached during the March 31 telephone conference, the Section 103(a) rejection of claims 24, 51, and 57 should be withdrawn.

D. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, the pending claims comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112 and are patentable over the applied art. The applicants accordingly request reconsideration of the application and a Notice of Allowance. If the Examiner has any questions or believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact David Dutcher at (206) 359-6465.

Date: 5/15/06

Respectfully submitted,

Perkins Coie LLP

David T. Dutcher

Registration No. 51,638

Correspondence Address:

Customer No. 25096

Perkins Coie LLP

P.O. Box 1247

Seattle, Washington 98111-1247

(206) 359-8000